



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/761,583

01/22/2004

Liu Qing

089229.00130

4262

32294 7590 08/11/2009
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE
14TH FLOOR
VIENNA, VA 22182-6212

EXAMINER

SAM, PHIRIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2419

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/11/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/761,583	Applicant(s) QING ET AL.	
	Examiner PHIRIN SAM	Art Unit 2419	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41, 43 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35, 39-41, 43 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 36-38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01/22/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 27 and 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The term “**an intermediate node**” in claim 27 is considered similar to a “means” because it does not recite specific “structure, material or acts in support thereof” for performing the recited functions “i.e., the corresponding method step(s) recited in claim 27). Since there is only one recited “means” (**an intermediate node**) in independent claim 27, the claim is, in effect, single means claim that is improper under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element is subject to an undue breadth rejection. In the MPEP section, 2164.08(a) states that, “A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to Hyatt is possible, where the claim covers every

Art Unit: 2419

conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor”.

Regarding claim 28, this claim is similarly rejected as claim 27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 13, 14, 16, 35, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2005/0021589 of Southam (hereinafter “Southam”).

Regarding amended claim 1, Southam discloses a method comprising:

- (a) analyzing an incoming service request in a service request input node in terms of destination information contained in a service request (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraphs [0015], [0017]);
- (b) determining in said service request input node, whether the destination information enables a direct forwarding of said service request to a destination (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraph (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraph [0017]));
- (c) redirecting said service request by said service request input node (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]), when said determining determines that said direct forwarding is not enabled; wherein said redirecting comprises

Art Unit: 2419

- (c1) transmitting a received service request by said service request input node to an intermediate node (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0019]);
- (c2) based on said received service request, performing a look-up in a database by said intermediate node for obtaining destination information required to enable a forwarding of said service request to said destination (see Fig. 1, element 112 and 1116, paragraph [0020]);
- (c3) sending said destination information from said intermediate node to said service request input node (see Fig. 1, elements 112 and 104, paragraph [0020]);
- (c4) based on said sent destination information, forwarding said service request from said service request input node to said destination (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 108, paragraph [0019]);

Regarding claim 2, Southam discloses a method further comprising:
direct forwarding said service request by said service request input node to said destination, if said determining determines that said direct forwarding is enabled (see Figs. 1, 2, paragraphs [0017], [0018]).

Regarding claims 4 and 16, Southam discloses the analyzing comprises analyzing said incoming service request in said service request input node comprising a service node of a plurality of service nodes of said domain (see Fig. 1, elements 102, 104, 106, and 108, paragraph [0017], [0018], [0019]), with which a user terminal originating said service request is not associated, wherein said one of the plurality of service nodes receives said service request from within said domain (see Fig. 1, elements 102, 104, 106, and 108, paragraph [0017], [0018], [0019]).

Regarding claim 5, Southam discloses the determining comprises determining in said service request input node that the received service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal associated with said service node of said plurality of service nodes of said domain, and in response redirects said service request (see Fig. 1, elements 102, 104, 106, and 108, paragraph [0017], [0018], [0019]).

Regarding amended claim 13, Southam discloses a system comprising:

- (a) analyzing means in a service request input node for analyzing an incoming service request in terms of destination information contained in a service request (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraphs [0015], [0017]);
- (b) determining means in said service request input node for determining, whether the destination information enables a direct forwarding of said service request to a destination (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraph [0017]);
- (c) redirecting control means in said service request input node for controlling a redirecting of said service request (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]), when said determining means determines that said direct forwarding is not enabled; wherein said redirecting is performed by
- (d) transmitting means in said service request input node for transmitting a received service request from said service request input node to an intermediate node (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0019]);
- (e) look-up means in said intermediate node for performing, based on said service request received by receiving means, a look-up in a database for obtaining destination information required to enable a forwarding of said service request to said destination (see Fig. 1, element 112 and 1116, paragraph [0020]);

Art Unit: 2419

- (f) sending means in said intermediate node for sending said destination information from said intermediate node to said service request input node (see Fig. 1, elements 112 and 104, paragraph [0020]);
- (g) forwarding means in said service request input node for forwarding said service request, based on said sent destination information, from said service request input node to said destination (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 108, paragraph [0019]).

Regarding amended claim 14, Southam discloses forwarding means in said service request input node for forwarding said service request to said destination, when said determining means determines that said direct forwarding is enabled (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraph [0018]).

Regarding amended claim 35, Southam discloses a system comprising:

- (a) an analyzing unit in a service request input node, said analyzing unit configured to analyze an incoming service request in terms of destination information contained in a service request (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraphs [0015], [0017]);
- (b) a first determining unit in said service request input node, said first determining unit configured to determine, whether the destination information enables a direct forwarding of said service request to a destination (see Fig. 1, element 104, paragraph [0017]);
- (c) a redirecting control unit in said service request input node, said redirecting control unit configured to control a redirecting of said service request (see Figs. 1, 2, 3a, element 106, paragraphs [0019], [0031], [0037]), when said
- (d) determining unit determines that said direct forwarding is not enabled; wherein said redirecting is performed by:

Art Unit: 2419

- (d1) a transmitting unit in said service request input node, said transmitting unit configured to transmit a received service request from said service request input node to an intermediate node (see Figs. 1, 2, paragraphs [0019], [0021], [0029]);
- (e) a look-up unit in said intermediate node, said look-up unit configured to perform, based on said service request received by a receiving unit, a look-up in a database for obtaining destination information required to enable a forwarding of said service request to said destination (see Fig. 1, element 112 and 1116, paragraph [0020]);
- (f) a sending unit in said intermediate node, said sending unit configured to send said destination information from said intermediate node to said service request input node (see Fig. 1, elements 112 and 104, paragraph [0020]);
- (g) a first forwarding unit in said service request input node, said forwarding unit configured to forward said service request, based on said sent destination information, from said service request input node to said destination (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 108, paragraph [0019]).

Regarding amended claim 43, Southam discloses a method comprising:

- (a) analyzing an incoming service request in a service request input node in terms of destination information contained in a service request (see Figs. 1, 3a, 4, paragraphs [0036], [0041]);
- (b) determining in said service request input node, whether the destination information enables a direct forwarding of said service request to a destination (see Figs. 1, 3a, paragraphs [0036], [0042]);
- (c) redirecting said service request by said service request input node, when said determining determines that said direct forwarding is not enabled; wherein said redirecting comprises

Art Unit: 2419

transmitting a received service request by said service request input node to an intermediate node (see Figs. 1, 3a, paragraph [0037]);

(d) receiving destination information from said intermediate node to said service request input node, said destination information required to enable a forwarding of said service request to said destination (see Figs. 1, paragraph [0020]);

(e) based on said sent destination information, forwarding said service request from said service request input node to said destination (see Figs. 1, 3a, paragraphs [0039]);

Regarding amended claim 44, Southam discloses a method comprising:

(a) receiving at an intermediate node a received service request from a service request input node, wherein said service request input node analyzes an incoming service request in terms of destination information contained in a service request, determines whether the destination information enables a direct forwarding of said service request to a destination, and redirects said service request as said received service request if said direct forwarding is not enabled (see Fig. 1, 2, 3a, element 106, paragraphs [0019], [0031], [0035]);

(b) based on said received service request, performing a look-up in a database by said intermediate node for obtaining destination information required to enable a forwarding of said service request to said destination (see Figs. 1, 2, 3a, paragraphs [0024], [0035], [0036], [0044]);

(c) sending said destination information from said intermediate node to said service request input node to enable said service request input node, based on said sent destination information, to forward said service request from said service request input node to said destination (see Figs. 1, 3a, paragraphs [0035], [0036]);

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 3, 6-11, 15, 17-23, 25-34, 39, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2005/0021589 of Southam (hereinafter "Southam") in view of US Patent 7,325,058 to Sheth et al. (hereinafter "Sheth").

Regarding claims 3, 15, and 30, Southam discloses all limitations. On the other hand, Southam does not disclose an entry node receives said service request from outside of said domain. However, Sheth discloses an entry node receives said service request from outside of said domain (see Figs. 1 and 6, abstract, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine an entry node receives said service request from outside of said domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the

Art Unit: 2419

subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 3, 15, and 30.

Regarding claims 6, 17, 18, and, 32, Southam does not disclose the determining comprises determining in said service request input node that the received service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal not associated with said service node of said plurality of service nodes of said domain, and forwards said service request to said entry node of said domain for relaying said service request to another domain. However, Sheth discloses the determining comprises determining in said service request input node that the received service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal not associated with said service node of said plurality of service nodes of said domain, and forwards said service request to said entry node of said domain for relaying said service request to another domain (see Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the determining comprises determining in said service request input node that the received service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal not associated with said service node of said plurality of service nodes of said domain, and forwards said service request to said entry node of said domain for relaying said service request to another domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 6, 17, 18, and 32.

Art Unit: 2419

Regarding claims 7, 19, and 26, Southam does not disclose analyzing comprises analyzing said incoming service request contained in said service requests comprising AAA service requests associated with authentication, authorization, and accounting functions. However, Sheth discloses disclose analyzing comprises analyzing said incoming service request contained in said service requests comprising AAA service requests associated with authentication, authorization, and accounting functions (see Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine analyzing comprises analyzing said incoming service request contained in said service requests comprising AAA service requests associated with authentication, authorization, and accounting functions teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 7, 19, and 26.

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Southam does not disclose analyzing comprises processing said service requests based on a Diameter base protocol. However, Sheth discloses analyzing comprises processing said service requests based on a Diameter base protocol (see col. 5, lines 63-67, and col. 6, lines 1-14). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine analyzing comprises processing said service requests based on a Diameter base protocol teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4,

Art Unit: 2419

lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 8 and 20.

Regarding claim 9 and 21, Southam discloses the analyzing comprises analyzing said incoming service request in said service request input node comprising said entry node of said domain comprising a proxy node (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]).

Regarding claim 10 and 22, Southam discloses the analyzing comprises analyzing said incoming service request in said service request input node comprising said entry node of said domain comprising a relay node (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0021]).

Regarding claims 11 and 23, Southam does not disclose providing a network including a plurality of domains, wherein the network comprises an Internet, and wherein the plurality of domains are established by respective service providers. However, Sheth discloses providing a network including a plurality of domains, wherein the network comprises an Internet, and wherein the plurality of domains are established by respective service providers (see Fig. 1 and 6, col. 2, lines 16-22). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine providing a network including a plurality of domains, wherein the network comprises an Internet, and wherein the plurality of domains are established by respective service providers teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 11 and 23.

Art Unit: 2419

Regarding amended claim 25, Southam discloses an apparatus comprising:

- (a) receiving means for receiving a service request from a service request input node (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]);
- (b) look-up means for performing, based on a received service request, a look-up in a database for obtaining destination information required for forwarding said service request to a destination (see Fig. 1, element 112 and 1116, paragraph [0020]);
- (c) sending means for sending said destination information from the apparatus to said service request input node (see Fig. 1, elements 112 and 104, paragraph [0020]), wherein said service request input node is configured to forward said service request, based on said received destination information, from the service request input node to said destination (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 108, paragraphs [0019], [0021]);

Southam does not disclose relaying said service request to another domain. However, Sheth discloses relaying said service request to another domain (see Figs. 1 and 6, col. 2, lines 16-53, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine relaying said service request to another domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claim 25.

Regarding amended claim 27, Southam discloses an apparatus comprising:

- (a) an intermediate node (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 106) configured to

Art Unit: 2419

- receive a service request from a service request input node (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]);
- obtain based on a received service request destination information for forwarding said service request to a destination (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]);
- send said destination information from the intermediate node to said service request input node (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0020]);
- forward said service request based on said received destination information from the service request input node to said destination (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 108, paragraphs [0019], [0021]);

Southam does not disclose relaying said service request to another domain. However, Sheth discloses relaying said service request to another domain (see Figs. 1 and 6, col. 2, lines 16-53, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine relaying said service request to another domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claim 27.

Regarding amended claims 28 and 34, Southam does not disclose the service requests comprise AAA service requests associated with authentication, authorization, and accounting purposes functions. However, Sheth discloses the service requests comprise AAA service requests associated with authentication, authorization, and accounting purposes functions (see

Art Unit: 2419

Figs. 3 and 6, col. 3, lines 31-46, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the service requests comprise AAA service requests associated with authentication, authorization, and accounting purposes functions teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 28 and 34.

Regarding amended claims 29 and 33, Southam discloses an apparatus comprising:

- (a) redirecting control means for controlling a redirecting of a received incoming service request (see Figs. 1, 2, 3a, element 106, paragraphs [0019], [0031], [0037]);
- (b) transmitting means for transmitting said received incoming service request to an intermediate node for obtaining destination information required for forwarding a service request to a destination (see Figs. 1, 2, paragraphs [0019], [0021], [0029]);
- (c) determining means for determining when the received incoming service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal not associated with said service nodes of said domain (see Figs. 1, 3a, paragraphs [0036]);
- (d) forwarding means for forwarding said service request, based on said received destination information, from the apparatus to said destination (see Fig. 1, elements 104 and 108, paragraphs [0019], [0021]);

Southam does not disclose relaying said service request to another domain. However, Sheth discloses relaying said service request to another domain (see Figs. 1 and 6, col. 2, lines

Art Unit: 2419

16-53, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine relaying said service request to another domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 29 and 33.

Regarding amended claim 39, Southam discloses an apparatus comprising:

- (a) a receiving unit configured to receive a service request from a service request input node (see Fig. 1, element 106, paragraph [0019]);
- (b) a look-up unit configured to perform, based on a received service request, a lookup in a database for obtaining destination information required for forwarding said service request to a destination (see Fig. 1, element 112 and 1116, paragraph [0020]);
- (c) a sending unit configured to send said destination information from the apparatus to said service request input node (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0020]), wherein said service request input node is configured to forward said service request, based on said received destination information, from the service request input node to said destination (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0021]);

Southam does not disclose relaying said service request to another domain. However, Sheth discloses relaying said service request to another domain (see Figs. 1 and 6, col. 2, lines 16-53, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine relaying said service request to another domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to

Art Unit: 2419

provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claim 39.

Regarding amended claim 40, Southam discloses an apparatus, comprising:

- (a) a redirecting control unit configured to control a redirecting of a received incoming service request (see Figs. 1, 2, 3a, element 106, paragraphs [0019], [0031], [0037]);
- (b) a transmitting unit configured to transmit said received incoming service request to an intermediate node for obtaining destination information required for forwarding a service request to a destination (see Figs. 1, 2, paragraph [0029], [0031]);
- (c) a determining unit configured to determined whether the received incoming service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal not associated with said service node of said domain (see Figs. 1-3a, paragraph [0036]);
- (d) a forwarding unit configured to forward said service request, based on said received destination information, from the apparatus to said destination (see Figs. 1-3a, paragraph [0035]);

Southam does not disclose relaying said service request to another domain. However, Sheth discloses relaying said service request to another domain (see Figs. 1 and 6, col. 2, lines 16-53, col. 7, lines 42-67, and col. 8, lines 1-13). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine relaying said service request to another domain teaching by Sheth with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide to determine whether the subscriber is authorized to access the domain based upon the

Art Unit: 2419

domain identifier and a list of authorized domains read on column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sheth and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claim 40.

Regarding amended claim 31, Southam discloses the apparatus comprises a service node of a domain, and receives service requests from within said domain (see Fig. 1, paragraphs [0017], [0018]).

Regarding amended claim 41, Southam discloses the apparatus further comprises a determining unit configured to determine whether the received incoming service request from within said domain is destined for a user terminal associated with said service node of said domain, and redirects said service request, when said service request is destined for a user terminal associated with said service node of said domain (see Fig. 1, paragraphs [0017], [0018], [0019]).

8. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2005/0021589 of Southam (hereinafter "Southam") in view of US 2003/0091030 of Yegin et al. (hereinafter "Yegin").

Regarding claims 12 and 24, Southam does not disclose providing a network including a plurality of domains, wherein the network comprises a Third Generation mobile communication network. However, Yegin discloses providing a network including a plurality of domains, wherein the network comprises a Third Generation mobile communication network (see Fig. 1, paragraph [0032]). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine a Third Generation mobile communication network teaching by Yegin with Southam. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide

Art Unit: 2419

authenticating mobile client and access router to each other before any network access is granted read on paragraph [0008]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yegin and Southam to obtain the invention as specified in the claims 12 and 24.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 36-38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims above have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHIRIN SAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3082. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flexitime Policy (IFP) Program.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272 - 3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2419

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2009

By: /Phirin Sam/
Phirin Sam
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2419